



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

fw

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/865,773	05/25/2001	Aruna Rohra Suda	4233-4002	5757
27123	7590	07/17/2006		
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P. 3 WORLD FINANCIAL CENTER NEW YORK, NY 10281-2101			EXAMINER	
			CHANNAVAJALA, SRIRAMA T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2166	

DATE MAILED: 07/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/865,773	SUDA ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Sirrama Channavajjala	2166	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 May 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) See Continuation Sheet is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) See Continuation Sheet is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. .
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 03/27/2006.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other:

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-326)

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims pending in the application are 1-4,6-10,12-15,18-21,26-50,52-57,59-64,66,67,69,71-73,75-85,87,92-94,96,97 and 99.

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims rejected are 1-4,6-10,12-15,18-21,26-50,52-57,59-64,66,67,69,71-73,75-85,87,92-94,96,97 and 99.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Claims 1-4,6-10,12-15,18-21,26-50,52-57,59-64,66-67,69,71-73,75-85,87,92-94,96-97,99 are pending in this application.
2. Claims 1,12,47-49,59,60,62,69,87,93,94 have been amended [Supplemental amendment filed on 5/11/2006]
3. Claims 5,11,16-17,22-25,51,58,65,68,70,74,86,88-91,95,98 have been cancelled [Supplemental amendment filed on 5/11/2006]
4. Examiner considered applicant's both supplemental amendment and amendment filed on 3/27/2006, 5/11/2006.
5. In view of the appeal Brief filed on 7/7/2005, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED, and non-final action was mailed on 01/18/2006
6. In view of applicant's response to notification of non-complaint appeal brief filed on 07 July 2005, examiner hereby withdrawn "Final-Office action" mailed on 11/22/2004.
7. Claims 1-15,18-57,59-93 are pending in this application.
8. Claims 16-17,58 are cancelled, see paper filed on 6/15/2004
9. Claims 80-93 have been added, see paper filed on 6/15/2004
10. In view of the applicant proper number form of the claims, the claim objections set forth in the previous office action is hereby withdrawn.

Drawings

11. Examiner acknowledges applicant substituted drawings
fig: 6,10,24,35,31,32,34,35,37-41,85,89 acceptable for examination purpose,
filed on 6/15/2004.

Priority

12. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority based on an application Serial No. 2000-197293, 2000-248999, 2000-314601, filed in JAPAN on 5/29/2000, 7/7/2000, 10/16/2000 respectively. Examiner acknowledges applicant submitted certified copy of the 2000-197293, 2000-248999, 2000-314601 applications as required by 35 U.S.C. 119(b).

Information Disclosure Statement

13. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 03/27/2006 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner, a copy of PTO-1448 is enclosed with this office action.

14.

15. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 03/08/2005 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner, a copy of PTO-1448 is enclosed with previous office action.

16. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 9/25/2001, paper no. # 3; 4/11/2002, paper no. # 4; 12/8/2003, paper no. # 5; 8/28/2003, paper no. # 6 respectively acknowledged. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner, a copy of PTO-1448 is enclosed with previous office action, paper no. # 7.

Double Patenting

17. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

18. Claims 1-15,18-57,59-93 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-58 of co pending Application No. 09/938,866, filed on 8/24/2001, claims 1-42 of application 10/116,932 filed on 4/5/2002, claims 1-37 of application 10/117,514 filed on 4/5/2002, 1-51 of application 10/387,002 filed on 3/12/2003, 1-42 of application 10/387,005 filed on 3/12/2003 .

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the referenced copending applications and would be covered by any patent granted on that copending applications since the referenced copending applications and the instant applications are claiming similar, common subject matter. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because in the present application Independent Claims 1,59-60,80,93 are directed to data processing system setting means for setting a condition for web page...data acquisition means for acquiring web page data; determination means for determining whether the acquired web page data...indexing means for assigning a predetermined index to web page data...saving means for saving the web page data....[claim 1,59-60,93], extracting data within a predetermined meta tag ...displaying, when the retrieved web page.... [claim 80] ; while co-pending Application No. 09/938,866, independent Claims 1,24 are directed to a data processing apparatus comprising means for initiating saving....saving one of either an internet page content displayedURL of the page; means for acquiring....initiating saving;; means for indexing.....predetermined index to data....means for data saving acquired data....predetermined storage unit.

Co-pending application no. **10/116,932** independent claims 1,34-42 directed to information processing systemreceiving means for receiving information...internet; transmission mens....client terminals, ...server information.....display means for displaying.....

Co-pending application no. **10/117,514** independent claims 1,19,37 directed to information processing....information obtaining means for obtaining information; template selection means....extraction means for extracting data....saving means for saving data.....

Co-pending application no. **10/387,002** independent claims 1,36,43,46-47,50-51 directed to information processing methodobtaining a processing instruction from a displayed web page, transferring theprocessing instruction.

Co-pending application no. **10/387,005** independent claims 1,27,38-42 directed to a data processing method comprising...obtaining data displayed by a browser, importing data without displaying the data, storing and managing the obtained data.....

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of data processing at the time the invention was made to modify the cited steps as indicated copending **09/938,866**, independent Claims 1,24 , application **10/116,932** independent claims 1,34-42, **10/117,514** independent claims 1,19,37, **10/387,002** independent claims 1,36,43,46-47,50-51, **10/387,005** independent claims 1,27,38-42, since the omission and addition of the cited limitations would have not changed the process according to which the data processing web page related data, particularly would perform the same function of managing web page related data . In re Karlson, 136 USPQ 184 (CCPA

1963). Accordingly, the instant Claims are broad and within the scope of the Claims of copending applications.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

19. *Claims 1-4,6-10,12-15,18-21,26-50,52-57,59-64,66-67,69,71-73,75-76,93, 97,99, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Debbie Pinard et al. [hereafter Debbie], GB 2324896 published on Nov 1998 in view of Walls et al. [hereafter Walls], US Patent No. 5848410 published on Dec 8, 1998.*

20. As to Claims 1,50, 59-60,93, Debbie teaches a system which including 'setting means for setting a condition for web page data to be saved, in advance of acquiring the web page data' [page 2, line 36-38, page 6, line 34-38], Debbie teaches web pages are generated and saved as web page template in advance as detailed in page 2, line 36-38

'data acquisition means for acquiring web page data' [page 3, line 3-4,page 10, line 18-24], acquiring web page data' corresponds to Debbie's template file information; 'determination means for determining whether the acquired web page data satisfies the condition' [page 10, line 29-35, fig 5], web page data corresponds to fig 5, element415,425,435,445,455

'dynamically assigned to the web page data' [page 12, line 25-29]
'saving means for saving the requested web page data' [page 11, line 25-27], saving the requested web page data corresponds to saving template information including parent web page data or HTML saved on the server element 120 as detailed in page 11, line 25-27; 'storage unit if the condition is determined to be satisfied, the saved web page data being sufficient to regenerate at least a portion of the web page' [page 11, line 4-6, page 12, line 20-24]

It is however, noted that Debbie does not specifically teach "keyword extraction means, indexing means". On the other hand, Walls disclosed 'keyword extraction means' [col 8, line 38-42], keywords corresponds to fig 2, element 224; indexing means' [col 8, line 32-35], indexing corresponds to Walls' fig 2, element 238

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Walls et al. into web page generator for organizational directory of Debbie et al. because both Debbie and Walls are specifically directed to generating and accessing web page [Walls: Abstract; Debbie: Abstract], particularly, Walls specifically teaches index generator of the index builder formats the stored search elements in the HTML format [Walls: col 5, line 44-52], while Debbie specifically teaches web page generator and displaying web page directory and regeneration of parent web page [page 11, line 4-6, page 12, line 20-24].

one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Walls et al. into web page generator for organizational directory of Debbie et al. because that would have allowed users of Debbie to index-organizing HTML data including keyword index that identifies not only elements or keywords, but also specific location for example header information, bringing the advantages of user to specify a search character or string of such characters, such as search word, and be presented with a search report in HTML format that indicates which of the files in the file system have an index-organizing element that contains the search characters as suggested by Walls [page 5, line 52-57].

Art Unit: 2166

21. As to Claim 2, Debbie teaches a system which including 'acquisition means acquires data from a browser client, said browser client allowing browsing of data in an Internet' [page 6, line 34-39, page 7, line 1-2]].

22. As to Claim 3, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 1 above. In addition, Debbie disclosed 'storage unit is a database' [[page 6, line 34-35].

23. As to claim 4, Walls disclosed 'sorting means for sorting indices of the data in the storage unit' [col 7, line 8-12];

'display means for displaying a result of the sorting by said sorting means' [col 6, line 58-63].

24. As to claim 6, 66, Walls disclosed 'selecting means for selecting an index from the indices displayed on said display means' [col 6, line 36-38];

'retrieval means for retrieving data corresponding to the index selected by said selecting means from the database' [col 6, line 44-50].

25. As to claim 7, 67, Walls disclosed 'deleting means for deleting at least one index from the indices displayed on said display means' [col 3, line 52-55, col 4, line 58-60, col 5, line 7-8];

'removal means for removing data corresponding to the index deleted by said deleting means from the database' [col 7, line 8-12].

26. As to claim 8, Walls disclosed 'wherein at least one of the data has a plurality of values for an index, and said sorting means places the plurality of values at positions corresponding to respective values' [col 20, line 33-41].

27. As to claim 9, 72, Walls disclosed 'folder creation means for creating a new folder for newly browsed data' [col 13, line 8-12, line 53-56];
'file name assigning means for assigning a predetermined name to the newly browsed data without intervention by a user' [col 13, line 41-45]
'file saving means for saving the newly browsed data in the new folder with the assigned file name' [col 13, line 56-61].

28. As to claim 10, Walls disclosed 'folder creation means creates the new folder with a folder name created based on a predetermined rule' [col 13, line 24-27].

29. As to claim 12,73, Walls disclosed 'file name generation means a unique file name for the newly browsed data without intervention by a user' [col 11, col 11, line 57-61, line 62-64].
'file saving means for saving the newly browsed data with adding the generated file name' [col 13, line 56-61].

30. As to claim 13, Walls disclosed 'wherein said indexing means acquires a URL of the data from the browser as the index' [col 25, line 34-36].

31. As to claim 14, Walls disclosed 'indexing means acquires a title embedded in the data from the browser as the index' [col 14, line 30-32].

32. As to claim 15, Walls disclosed 'each group corresponds to a network session' [col 1, line 26-36, col 10, line 41-48].

33. As to claim 18, Walls disclosed 'word assigning means for assigning a word specified by a user as a further index to the data to be saved by said saving means' [col 2, line 59-63]

34. As to claim 19, Walls disclosed 'wherein if an index assigned to the data to be saved has been assigned to their data, said saving means saves the data as a new data or updates the other data according to a setting by the user' [col 12, line 39-44].

35. As to claim 20, Walls disclosed 'wherein if an index assigned to the data to be saved has been assigned to other data, said saving means inquires to the user whether the data is to be saved as a new data or an updated data' [col 8, line 5-13].

36. As to claim 21, Walls disclosed 'comparing means for comparing the effective period with a current time at a predetermined timing' [col 13, line 24-32]; 'removal means for removing data in correspondence with the effective period before the current time based upon the result of a comparison by said comparing means' [col 13, line 36-45].

37. As to claim 26, 92, Walls disclosed 'wherein said saving means saves the browsed data in a first save mode and saves a URL for the browsed data in place of the browsed data in a second save mode' [col 2, line 35-38].

38. As to claim 27, Walls disclosed 'wherein said setting means sets whether or not data linked to the browsed data is to be saved with the browsed data' [col 22, line 57-61].

39. As to claim 28, Walls disclosed 'wherein said setting means can set to save all the browsed data without any instruction for each of the browsed data by the user' [col 23, line 25-32].

40. As to claim 29, Walls disclosed 'wherein said saving means saves the browsed data when the browsing is operated to move to another URL' [col 24, line 42-45].

41. As to claim 30, Walls disclosed 'wherein said setting means can set not to sae the browsed data in a URL specified by the user' [col 24, line 54-59].

42. As to claim 31, Walls disclosed 'index extracting means for extracting as an index a specific data from a data train constituting address of the browsed data in the network on the basis of a predetermined rule' [col 4, line 26-30].

43. As to claim 32, Walls disclosed 'wherein the specific data is a domain name' [col 5, line 7-11].

44. As to claim 33, Walls disclosed 'wherein the predetermined rule is a rule for eliminating a parameter, a protocol, an obvious address, and page data from the data train, and extracting a domain name from the rest of the data with referring to a knowledge base of domain names' [col 8, line 58-61].

45. As to claim 34, Walls disclosed 'wherein the specific data is a name of organization' [col 22, line 57-60].

46. As to claim 35-37, Walls disclosed 'wherein the predetermined rule is a rule for eliminating a parameter, a protocol, an obvious address, page data, and domain name from the data train, and determining the rest of the data as an organization name' [fig 7, col 22, line 57-66].

47. As to claim 38, Walls disclosed 'wherein the specific part is a URL of the saved data' [col 23, line 3-6].

48. As to claim 39, Walls disclosed 'wherein the specific part is the saved data except for an embedded image' [col 1, line 39-42].

49. As to claim 40-42, 75-76,87, Walls disclosed 'editing means for editing the browsed data' [col 15, line 17-19].

50. As to claim 43, Walls disclosed 'editing means includes changing means for changing a display form of a designated portion in the browsed data' [col 25, line 25-31].

51. As to claim 44, 77, Walls disclosed 'extraction means for extracting a predetermined type of data from the browsed data' [col 18, line 38-43];
'extracted data saving means for saving the extracted data in the database'
[col 12, line 49-53].

52. As to claim 45, Walls disclosed 'extraction means extracts data in a predetermined column in response to a copying operation of data from a specified portion of the browsed data to the predetermined column, and said extracted data saving means saves the extracted data with an attribute corresponding to the predetermined column' [col 20, line 1-15].

53. As to claim 46, Walls disclosed 'wherein the predetermined type of data includes at least one of an organization name, a person name, an E-mail address, a telephone number, a fax number, and a keyword appended to the data' [col 23, line 39-45].

54. As to claim 47, Walls disclosed 'wherein if the data requested to be saved includes data from other URL identified in the web page data, said data acquisition means downloads the included data from the other URL' [col 2, line 35-38].

55. As to claim 48, Walls disclosed 'wherein if the data from the other URL is already available in the storage unit, said data acquisition means dispenses with the downloading of the data' [col 8, line 58-61].

56. As to claim 49, Walls disclosed 'mode selection means for selecting an automatic save mode, and in the automatic save mode, said determination means determines the condition to be satisfied to save the browsed data every time a new web page is browsed' [col 8, line 45-49].

57. As to claim 50, Walls disclosed 'wherein said data acquisition means, said determination means, said indexing means, said saving means, and said database are equipped in a server apparatus, and said system further comprising at least one client apparatus connected to said server apparatus, each of said client apparatus transmits a user request to said server apparatus and receives a response to the user request from said server apparatus' [fig 1-2,col 9, line 31-36].

58. As to claim 52-53, Walls disclosed 'a local database' [col 9, line 35-36]; 'a web information storage device for storing web information acquired from an internet' [col 10, line 39-40]; 'administration means for administrating data in either of said database, said local database, and said web information storage device' [col 10, line 57-62].

59. As to claim 54-57, Walls disclosed 'database is equipped in a server apparatus [fig 1], and said data acquisition means, said determination means, said indexing means, and said saving means are equipped in at least one client apparatus connected to said server apparatus' [col 10, line 35-41, fig 1-2].

60. As to claim 61, Walls disclosed 'index is dynamically generated' [col 11, line 35-39, fig 2].

61. As to claim 62, Walls disclosed 'storage unit is a database' [fig 1, element 165].

62. As to claim 63, Walls disclosed 'retrieving data from said database on a user-supplied index' [col 12, line 49-54].

63. As to claim 64, Walls disclosed 'sorting indices of the data saved in the database' [col 11, line 25-28].

64. As to claim 69, Walls disclosed 'sending the acquired data to a predetermined destination' [col 12, line 53-57].

65. As to claim 71, Walls disclosed 'data is acquired from a browser client, said browser client allowing browsing of data in an internet' [fig 1-2, col 20, line 47-53].

66. As to claim 78, Walls disclosed 'indexing means displays the extracted keyword or the title acquired from the browser' [col 12, line 33-37].

67. As to claim 79, Walls disclosed 'index includes a time when the data is saved, said system further comprising: node creation means for creating nodes corresponding to groups classified on the basis of the timing of saving, said node creation means create a hierarchy of nodes [col 8, line 50-55] by dividing a group corresponding to a period into a plurality of sub group each corresponding to a shorter period and creating a node corresponding to each of sub group' [col 9, line 3-9]; 'node displaying means for

displaying a plurality of nodes created by said node creation means in an order of saving' [col 9, line 11-16].

68. As to claim 80, Walls disclosed 'extracting data within a predetermined meta tag from a web page retrieved by a browser' [col 11, line 29-32]; 'displaying, when the retrieved web page is displayed in an area, the extracted data in a predetermined field outside of the area' [fig 7-8].

69. As to claim 81, Walls disclosed 'saving the displayed web page in a storage unit in correspondence with data displayed in the predetermined field as an index' [col 12, line 23-28].

70. As to claim 82-83, Walls disclosed 'predetermined meta tag is that of a keyword for the web page' [col 12, line 42-48, col 14, line 54-62].

71. As to claim 84-85, Walls disclosed 'displaying a list of indices for web pages saved in the storage unit, receiving from a user a designation of an index in the displayed list of indices' [col 15, line 63-67, col 16, line 1-3]; 'displaying the web page corresponding to the designated index' [fig 7-8].

72. As to claims 94,97, Walls disclosed 'receiving means for receiving an index' [col 6, line 36-38]; 'searching the predetermined storage unit for web page data stored in correspondence with the same index as the received index' [col 11, line 25-35].

73. As to claims 96,99, Walls disclosed 'save instruction receiving means for receiving a save instruction from a user, wherein said indexing means assigns the index to the web page data and said saving means saves the web page data if the save instruction is received' [col 15, line 63-67, col 16, line 1-3, col 20, line 54-58].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

74. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

75. *Claims 80-85,87,92 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Singhal US Patent No. 6370527 filed on Dec 29, 1998.*

76. As to claim 80, Singhal teaches a system which including 'extracting data within a predetermined meta tag from a web page retrieved by a browser' [col 2, line 35-37, col 3, line 57-59, col 4, line 1-4, col 5, line 1-4, line 16-24, line 44-47], Singhal is directed to meta-search engine, particularly extracting search terms, titles and occurrence of the search terms that corresponds to predetermined meta tag from multiple listings;; 'displaying, when the retrieved web page is displayed in an area, the extracted data in a predetermined field outside of the area' [fig 2, col 2, line 39-42].

77. As to claim 81, Singhal disclosed 'saving the displayed web page in a storage unit in correspondence with the data displayed in the predetermined field as an index'[col 2, line 66-67, col 3, line 1-3, line 30-32].

78. As to claim 82, Singhal disclosed 'predetermined meta tag is that of a keyword for the web page' [col 4, line 13-17].

79. As to claim 83, Singhal disclosed 'predetermined meta tag is that of a title for the web page' [col 5, line 1-4].

80. As to claim 84, Singhal disclosed 'displaying a list of indices for web pages saved in the storage unit' [col 6, line 30-32]; 'receiving from a user a designation of an index in the displayed list of indices' [col 6, line 29-37]; 'displaying the web page corresponding to the designated index' [col 6, line 61-65].

81. As to claim 85, Singhal disclosed 'list of indices is displayed in another area when the retrieved web page is displayed in the area' [see fig 2].

82. As to claim 86, Singhal disclosed 'sorting the list of indices, and displaying the sorted list of indices' [col 4, line 54-57].

83. As to claim 87, Singhal disclosed 'editing the displayed web page' [fig 2.], particularly displayed page allows various menu functions that including Edit.

84. As to claim 88, Singhal disclosed 'annotation is added to the displayed web pae' [col 4, line 41-44].

85. As to claim 89-91, Singhal disclosed 'sending the displayed web page or a part thereof to a specified destination' [col 3, line 17-20].

86. As to claim 92, Singhal disclosed 'a URL of the displayed web page is saved instead of the web page in said saving step' [col 3, line 30-32].

87. *Claims 80-85,87,92 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nielsen US Patent No. 6003046 published on Dec 14, 1999.*

88. As to claim 80, Nielsen teaches a system which including 'extracting data within a predetermined meta tag from a web page retrieved by a browser' [col 5, line 6-17], Nielsen is directed structured documents on the world wise web, more specifically hypertext page with the context information extracted from the web page, further selected web page is identified and extracting the data from the web page as detailed in col 5, line 6-17;

'displaying, when the retrieved web page is displayed in an area, the extracted data in a predetermined field outside of the area' [col 3, line 59-64, line 65-67, col 4, line 1-2, line 45-50], Nielsen specifically teaches hypertext page displayed as detailed in fig 2, further meta tags that identifying HTML code of fig 3 is also displayed as detailed in col 4, line 45-50]

89. As to claim 81, Nielsen disclosed 'saving the displayed web page in a storage unit in correspondence with the data displayed in the predetermined field as an index'[col 4, line 45-53]

90. As to claim 82, Nielsen disclosed 'predetermined meta tag is that of a keyword for the web page' [col 4, line 63-67, col 5, line 1-4].

91. As to claim 83, Nielsen disclosed 'predetermined meta tag is that of a title for the web page' [col 4, line 47-50].

92. As to claim 84, Nielsen disclosed 'displaying a list of indices for web pages saved in the storage unit' [col 3, line 55-58]; 'receiving from a user a designation of an index in the displayed list of indices' [col 3, line 51-54]; 'displaying the web page corresponding to the designated index' [col 3, line 59-64].

93. As to claim 85, Nielsen disclosed 'list of indices is displayed in another area when the retrieved web page is displayed in the area' [col 3, line 35-39].

94. As to claim 87, Nielsen disclosed 'editing the displayed tag data' [col 4, line 63-66]

95. As to claim 92, Nielsen disclosed 'a URL of the displayed web page is saved instead of the web page in said saving step' [col 4, line 20-24].

Response to Arguments

96. Applicant's arguments filed on 5/11/2006 and 3/27/2006 with respect to pending claims 1-4,6-10,12-15,18-21,26-50,52-57,59-64,66-67,69,71-73,75-85,87,92-94,96-97,99 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive, for examiner's response, see discussion below:

97. In view of applicant's submitted amendment [5/11/2006, 3/27/2006], claims 1-4,6-10,12-15,18-21,26-50,52-57,59-64,66-67,69,71-73,75-76,93, 97,99, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Debbie Pinard et al, GB 2324896 in view of Walls et al, US Patent No. 5848410.

a) At page 25, claim 80, applicant argues that "Singhal is silent as to any extracting of data within a predetermined meta tag from a web page retrieved by a browser, and is also silent as to the display of the web page and the display of the extracted data in an area outside the display area of the web page".

As to the argument [a] above, firstly, Singhal is directed to searching distributed networks, more specifically meta-search engine that searches information from multiple search engines [see Abstract], secondly, Singhal specifically teaches meta data related to various web pages are being extracted and stored in a memory for example listing of titles, search terms, and related search queries and like [col 4, line 48-53], thirdly,

Singhal specifically suggests displaying web pages for example is part of the prior art as detailed in fig 1-2, furthermore, Singhal also suggests specific parts of the information may be searched and outputted for example when user enters specific search query, user may select particular portions and display to the users as detailed in col 7, line 11-30.

As best understood by the examiner, Singhal specifically suggested displaying multiple search engine web pages that including specific search information describing "extracted data" for example as detailed in fig 2, therefore, displaying operation is integral part of Singhal's teaching.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record

- a. US Patent No. 6370527
- b. US Patent No. 5848410
- c. GB 2324896.
- d. US Patent No. 6003046

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Srirama Channavajjala whose telephone number is 571-272-4108. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM Eastern Time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alam, Hosain, T, can be reached on (571) 272-3978. The fax phone numbers for the organization where the application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free)

sc
Patent Examiner.
July 03, 2006.



SRIRAMA CHANNAVAJJALA
PRIMARY EXAMINER